ON HERESIES

THE PARENTS AND ARCHETYPES of all heresies are four in number, namely: (1) Barbarism; (2) Scythism; (3) Hellenism; (4) Judaism. Out of these came all the rest.

1. *Barbarism* is that which prevailed from the days of Adam down through ten generations to the time of Noe. It is called barbarism because of the fact that in those times men had no ruling authority or mutual accord, but every man was independent and a law unto himself after the dictates of his own will.

2. *Scythism* prevailed from the days of Noe down to the building of the Tower of Babel and for a few years after the Tower period, that is to say, until the time of Phaleg and Ragau.[1] These last migrated to the regions of Europe and, from the time of Thare[2]—from whom the Thracians sprung—and on, have been associated with the country and peoples of Scythia.

3. *Hellenism* arose from idolatry in the time of Sarug.[3] Since in those times everyone was given to superstition, when the races of men had begun to turn to a much more civil way of life, they turned also to idolatrous rites and usages,

1 Phaleg, the father of Ragau (Reu), who was the great great grandfather of Abraham (Gen. 11; Luke 3).
2 The father of Abraham.
3 The great-grandfather of Abraham.

and they began to deify men who had once walked among them. At first, they painted with colors and made pictures of those whom they had once held in esteem, whether tyrants or sorcerers or men who in their lifetime had done something deemed worthy of note in the line of courage or bodily strength. Then, after idolatry had been introduced, beginning with the times of Thare, the father of Abraham, they first put the potter's skill to use for the making of figures of their dead. And then they applied every art to their portrayal—the builders sculpturing in stone, the gold and silversmiths fashioning out of their own materials, and similarly the woodworkers, and so on. The Egyptians, however, together with the Babylonians and Phrygians and Phoenicians, were the first to introduce this kind of cult with its statues and mysteries. From them it passed to the Greeks, first in the time of Cecrops,[4] and from then on. Then, considerably later, the cults of Chronos, Ares, Zeus, Apollo, and the rest of the gods were introduced. Now the Greeks are called *Hellenes* after a certain Helenus, who was one of those who had come to settle in Greece. However, according to others, they are so called from the *elaea,* or olive tree, which sprung up at Athens. Their progenitors were the Ionians, who, by accurate report, descend from Javan.[5] He was one of those engaged in the building of the Tower, when the tongues of all were confounded, which is the reason for their all being also called Meropes, that is to say, 'men of divided voice,' because of the division of the tongues. Later on, as time went by, Hellenism split up into such sects as those of the Pythagoreans, Stoics, Platonists, and Epicureans. Besides, there was an ingrained religious sense which, along with the force of the natural law, had existed distinct from these nations and midway between Barbarism and Hellenism from

4 The mythical first king of Athens.

5 Joel 3.6 (Septuagint) has 'children of the Greeks' for the Hebrew 'sons of Javan.'

the foundation of the world down until such time as it converged with the religion of Abraham.

4. *Judaism* had from the time of Abraham received the seal of circumcision. By Moses, who was seventh after Abraham, it was committed to writing in the Law given by God. From Juda, the fourth son of Jacob, surnamed Israel, through David, who was the first of the tribe of Juda to rule, it acquired the definitive name of Judaism. It is apparent that the Apostle was summarizing these four heresies when he said: 'In Christ Jesus there is neither Barbarian, nor Scythian, nor Greek, nor Jew: but a new creature.'[6]

The Divisions of the Greeks.

5. *The Pythagoreans or Peripatetics.* Pythagoras held the monad and providence. He also held that it was forbidden to sacrifice, that is to say, to sacrifice to the gods. He furthermore forbade the eating of animals and enjoined abstinence from wine. He made a distinction between things from the moon on up, which he said were immortal, and those below, which he said were mortal. He also held the transmigration of souls from body to body, even in the case of animals and reptiles. He taught that silence should be kept for a period of five years, and finally he called himself God.

6. *The Platonists* held God and matter and form, and that the universe was created and subject to destruction, whereas the soul was uncreated, immortal, and divine. They held that this last had three parts: the rational, the irascible, and the appetitive. They also held that women should be the common property of all and that no one should have his own wife, but that those who wished might have intercourse with them that were agreeable. They likewise held the transmigration of souls into bodies, even into those of reptiles. And they also held that there were several gods produced from the One.

6 Col. 3.11; Gal. 6.15.

7. *The Stoics* hold that the universe is a body and they think that this sensible world is God. Certain of them have declared that it has its nature from the substance of fire. They also define God as a mind which is at the time the soul of the entire mass of heaven and earth. His body is, as I have said, the universe and His eyes the luminaries. Moreover, they hold that the flesh is completely destroyed and that the souls of all things pass from body to body.

8. *The Epicureans* supposed the beginning of all things to be in indivisible bodies with no parts, homogeneous, and infinite in number. And they held the end to be the enjoyment of pleasure, and that neither God nor providence governs things.

9. *Samaritanism* and the *Samaritans* of this sect. This originated with the Jews before the appearance of heresies among the Greeks and before their teachings took definite form but after they had received their religion. It stands between Judaism and Hellenism and took occasion to arise in the time of Nabuchodonosor and the Jewish captivity. These were Assyrian colonists who had settled in Judea and had received the Pentateuch of Moses which the king had sent them from Babylon at the hands of the priest called Esdras. They hold everything that the Jews do, except that they hold the Gentiles in abomination, avoid contact with certain things, deny the resurrection of the dead, and reject the post-Mosaic prophecies.

The Four Classes of Samaritans.

10. *The Gorthenes* celebrate their feasts at other times than Sebyaeans.

11. *The Sebyaeans* differ from the Gorthenes by reason of their feasts.

12. *The Essenes* are opposed to neither, but celebrate their feasts indifferently with whomsoever they chance to be.

13. *The Dosthenes* follow the same customs as do the

Samaritans, practicing circumcision and other things and using the Pentateuch. Like the others, but more so, they abstain from animal food and pass their lives in continuous fasting. Some of them also practice virginity and other asceticism. Some also believe in the resurrection of the dead, which belief is foreign to the Samaritans.

The Seven Heresies of the Jews.

14. *The Scribes,* who were certain lawyers and expounders of the traditions, come down to them from their forebears, very superstitiously observed customs which they had not learned from the Law, but had devised for themselves as rites and ceremonies over and above the prescriptions of the Law.

15. *The Pharisees,* which is interpreted as meaning 'those who are set apart,' followed the most perfect form of life and were, as they pretended, more to be esteemed than other people. They also held the resurrection of the dead, which the Scribes held too. As regards angels and the Holy Ghost, they agreed that such exist. They followed a special way of life, practicing asceticism and virginity for a period of time and fasting twice a week.[7] They performed the purifications of pots and plates and cups,[8] as did the Scribes, the paying of tithes, the offering of first-fruits, and the recitation of interminable prayers. They wore superstitious styles of clothing, such as the shawl, the tunics, or colobia, the wide phylacteries, that is, amulets made of purple stuff, the fringes,[9] and the tassels on the ends of their shawls—all of which served as signs of their periodic asceticism. They also introduced the horoscope and fate.

16. *The Sadduccees,* which is interpreted as meaning 'the most just,' were from the Samaritan race and from a priest

7 Luke 18.12.
8 Mark 7.4.
9 Matt. 23.5.

named Sadoc.[10] They denied the resurrection of the dead and acknowledged neither the angels nor the Spirit, but in other things were like the Jews.

17. *The Hemerobaptists*[11] were Jews in everything. However, they did say that no one would attain to eternal life unless he bathe himself every day.

18. *The Ossenes,*[12] which is interpreted as meaning 'the most reckless,' carried out everything according to the Law. However, while they use some of the Scriptures coming after the Law, they rejected most of the later Prophets.

19. *The Nasaraeans,* which is interpreted as meaning 'the rebellious,' forbid all eating of flesh meat and do not eat any animal food at all. Up to Moses and Josue the son of Nave, they accept and believe in the holy names of the patriarchs in the Pentateuch—Abraham, I mean, and Isaac, and Jacob, and their predecessors, and Moses himself, and Aaron, and Josue. They claim that Moses is not the author of the books of the Pentateuch, but they stoutly defend other books different from these.

20. *The Herodians* were Jews in everything. They looked for Christ in Herod and to him they imputed the dignity and the name of Christ.

Thus far the first part, which contains all these twenty heresies, and in which there is also something of the coming of Christ.[13]

21. *The Simonians* stem from Simon Magus, who lived in the time of the Apostle Peter and was a native of the village of Gitta in Samaria. This man was of Samaritan

10 3 Kings 1.34; 1 Paral. 29.22.

11 'Daily bathers.'

12 The only mention of this is by Epiphanius. They are probably mistakenly distinguished from the Essaeans, or Essenes.

13 This refers to the first part of the first book of the *Panarion* of Epiphanius. The descriptions of these first twenty heresies is taken verbatim from Epiphanius' summary of the first part of Book 1 (*PG* 41.165-172).

origin and became a Christian in name only. He taught a filthy obscenity of promiscuous bodily intercourse. He rejected the resurrection and affirmed that the universe was not created by God. He furthermore gave his disciples for adoration a likeness of himself as Zeus and of the harlot named Helen, who was his companion, as Athena. To the Samaritans he said that he was the Father, while to the Jews he said he was Christ.

22. *The Menandrianists* came from Simon through a certain Menander,[14] but in certain things they differed from the Simonians. They said that the universe was created by angels.

23. *The Saturnilians* were to be found throughout Syria. They followed the obscene doctrine of the Simonians, but they professed other things far more extraordinary. They originated with Saturnilus.[15] With Menander they held the universe to have been created by angels, but, in accordance with the opinion of their founder, by seven only.

24. *The Basilidians* follow the same obscene doctrine. They originate with Basilides, who with Saturnilus, was a disciple both of the Simonians and of the Menandrianists. He held similar opinions, although he differs in some things. Thus, he says that there are 365 heavens and to these he assigns angelic names. It is for this reason that the year has this same number of days, and the name *Abrasax,* which is 365,[16] is a holy name.

25. *The Nicolaitans* stem from Nicolas, who was ordained to serve by the Apostles.[17] Because of jealousy for his own wife, he was motivated to teach his disciples the practice of im-

14 An early second-century Samaritan magician and disciple of Simon Magus; cf. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* I xxiii 5 (*PG* 7.670-673).

15 Or Saturninus, an early Syrian Gnostic; cf. Irenaeus, *op. cit.,* I xxiv 1 (*PG* 7.673ff.)

16 That is, the sum of the numerical values of the Greek letters of the name.

17 Acts 6.5. The Nicolaites are mentioned in Apoc. 2.6,15.

morality with others. He also introduced to the world the doctrine of Caulacau, Prunicus, and other barbaric names.

26. *The Gnostics* succeeded to the foregoing heresies, but were more insanely given to the practice of immorality than all these others. In Egypt they are called Stratiotics and Phibionites, while in the upper regions they are called Socratites, and in still other places Zanchaeans. Some others call them Coddians, while still others call them Borborites. These make much of Barbelo and Bero.[18]

27. *The Carpocratians* originated with a certain Carpocrates, who was an Asiatic. He taught the practice of every sort of immorality and the cultivation of every kind of sin. Unless, he said, one pass through everything and do the will of all the demons and angels, he cannot attain the highest heaven or pass beyond the Principalities and the Powers. He furthermore said that Jesus had assumed an intellectual soul and, when He had come to know the things above, then He proclaimed them. And he said that should one do such things as Jesus had done, then one would be the same as He. Like the heresies originating with Simon and the others thus far treated, he repudiated both the Law and the resurrection of the dead. The Marcellina who was at Rome became a disciple of his. He furthermore secretely used to make images of Jesus, Paul, Homer, and Pythagoras, and to burn incense before them and worship them.

28. *The Cerinthians,* who are also called *Merinthians,* originated with Cerinthus and Merinthus.[19] They were certain Jews who made much of the circumcision and who said that the universe was created by the angels and that Jesus attained to the name of Christ by degrees.

---

18 Variations of the name of Barbero, one of the aeons of some Gnostic systems, a sort of female principle. Epiphanius has the proper form, *Panarion,* I.2 epitome *sub* vi (*PG* 41.284A).

19 Merinthus is mentioned only by Epiphanius and is probably the same as Cerinthus.

29. *The Nazarenes* confess Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, but live in all things according to the Law.

30. *The Ebionites* closely resemble the aforementioned Cerinthians and Nazarenes. In some respects the heresy of our Sampsaeans and Helcesaeans approaches theirs. They assert that Christ and the Holy Ghost were created in heaven and that Christ came to dwell in Adam, then for a time put him off, and finally put him on again. They say that He did this in His coming in the flesh. Although they are Jews, they use the Gospels. The eating of meat they hold in abomination. They hold water to be in the place of God. They furthermore hold, as I have said, that Christ put on man in His coming in the flesh. They bathe in water constantly, both summer and winter, reputedly for the sake of purification, as do the Samaritans.

31. *The Valentinians*[20] reject the resurrection of the flesh. They furthermore set the Old Testament aside, although they do accept the Prophets and whatsoever else is susceptible of an allegorical interpretation resembling their own heresy. They introduce certain strange myths, saying that there are thirty names of aeons and that these, whom they consider to be both gods and aeons, were begotten bisexual by the father of the universe. And they say that Christ brought His body from heaven and passed through Mary as through a channel.

32. *The Secundians*, who were joined by Epiphanes and Isidore, being like-minded with Valentinus, have the same syzygies.[21] To some extent, however, they detail other things which the Valentinians do not. They also forbid the use of flesh meat.

---

20 Valentinus, a second-century Alexandrian heretic, was one of the most important of the Gnostic leaders.

21 The male-female pairs of aeons in the Valentinian Gnostic system.

33. *The Ptolemaeans,* with whom Flora[22] is associated, are also disciples of Valentinus. In regard to the syzygies, they hold the same as do the Valentinians and Secundians, but they differ from these last in some respects.

Thus far the summary of the thirteen heresies contained in the second part of Book 1.[23]

The following belong to this third part, in which thirteen heresies are contained.[24]

34. *The Marcosaeans.* There was a certain Mark who was a fellow pupil with Colarbasus. He introduced two principles and rejected the resurrection of the dead. He furthermore used to perform certain tricks with drinking cups by changing the color of their contents to a dark purple by means of incantations; then he would initiate the women whom he had thus deluded. Like Valentinus, he pretended that all things were made up of the twenty-four elements.

35. *The Colarbasaeans.* This Colarbasus also taught the same things. In some respects, however, he differed from the other heresies, that is, from those of Mark and Valentinus, because he taught the emissions and the ogdoads in a different way.

36. *The Heracleonites* also seem to accept the mythology of the ogdoads, but differently from Mark, Ptolemy, Valentinus, and the rest. Like Mark, however, they redeem their dying at the hour of death with oil of opobalsam and water, at the same time reciting certain invocations couched in Hebrew words over the one supposedly being redeemed.

---

22 Flora is only known from the *Letter to Flora* composed by the Gnostic Ptolemaeus and preserved in *Panarion,* Heresy 33.3-7 (*PG* 41.557-568).

23 This refers to the second part of Book 1 of the *Panarion.* The description of the preceding thirteen heresies is taken verbatim from Epiphanius' epitome of Book I.2 (*PG* 41.281-286).

24 This refers to the third part of Book 1 of the *Panarion.* The description of the following thirteen heresies is Epiphanius' epitome of this part (*PG* 41.577-581).

37. *The Ophites* hold the serpent in honor and claim that it is Christ. And they keep a real serpent, the snake, in some sort of a basket.

38. *The Cainites* hold the same things as do those heresies which repudiate the Law and Him who spoke in the Law. While they deny the resurrection of the body, they hold Cain in honor and attribute to him extraordinary power. They likewise deify Judas, together with them that were with Core, Dathan, and Abiron, and together with the Sodomites.

39. *The Sethians* in turn, hold Seth in honor and claim that he was born of the supernatural mother after she had repented of giving birth to Cain and his. They say that, after she had given birth to Cain and Cain killed Abel, she had commerce with the supernal Father and produced the pure seed, which was Seth, from whom thereafter the entire human race was descended. These hold the doctrine of Principalities and Powers, and of a number of other things.

40. *The Archontics,* in turn, attribute the universe to a number of archons and claim that all things that have been made have been made by them. They are also guilty of certain immoral practices. They deny the resurrection of the flesh and reject the Old Testament. But they use both the Old and the New Testaments, distorting the meaning of every word to conform with their own way of thinking.

41. *The Cerdonians* are from Cerdon, who succeeded to the error of Heracleon and then added to the deceit. He came from Syria to Rome and, afterwards, in the time of Bishop Hyginus, expounded his teachings. He teaches that there are two principles which are opposed to each other and that Christ was not born. He likewise rejects the resurrection of the dead and the Old Testament.

42. *The Marcionites.* Marcion was a native of Pontus and the son of a bishop. But he violated a virgin and, having

on that account been excommunicated from the Church by his own father, he took to flight. He came to Rome, where he requested those who were ruling the Church at that time to receive him to penance; when he failed to obtain this, he became stirred up against the faith and gave out that there were three principles—the good, the just, and the evil—and that the New Testament was foreign to the Old Testament and to Him who spoke therein. Both he and his followers, the Marcionites, reject the resurrection of the body, but they do confer baptism—not only once, but even a second and third time after lapses into sin. And they even have others baptized for the catechumens who have died. They furthermore, without the least constraint, permit women to confer baptism.

43. *The Lucianists.* A certain Lucian—not he who lived in the time of Constantine, but an older one—held everything as Marcion did. They are, however, reputed to hold certain other things that were not taught by Marcion.

44. *The Apellians.* This Apelles also holds doctrines similar to those of Marcion and Lucian. He vilifies all creation and the Creator. He did not teach three principles, as did the others, but one God, who is supreme and nameless. And he taught that this God made another one. This last, he says, who was begotten, turned out to be evil and by his own wickedness created the world.

45. *The Severians.* A certain Severus, in turn, going still further than Apelles, rejects wine on the basis of a legend that the vine was bred of the commerce that Satan in the form of a serpent had with the earth. Woman, moreover, he deprecates, declaring that she has her existence from a sinister power. He furthermore introduces certain appellations of archons, and certain apocryphal books. Like the rest, he rejects the resurrection of the body and the Old Testament.

46. *The Tatianists.* This Tatian flourished contemporaneously with the most holy martyr and philosopher Justin. But after the death of St. Justin he unfortunately came under the influence of the teachings of Marcion and taught the same things as he, with some additions. He was said to have been a native of Mesopotamia.

Thus far the thirteen heresies contained in the first part of Book 2.[25]

The following are contained in the third part of the Book 2, totaling eighteen heresies.[26]

47. *The Encratites,* who happen to be a branch of the Tatianists, also reject marriage, which they declare to be of Satan. And they forbid all eating of animal food.

48. *The Cataphrygians,* or *Montanists,* or *Ascodrugites*[27] accept the Old and New Testaments, but they also introduce other prophets of whom they make much—a certain Montanus and a Priscilla.

49. *The Pepuzians,* who are also called *Quintillians,* and with whom the *Artotyrites*[28] are connected, constitute a distinct heresy. Although they belong to the Cataphrygians, they hold other things which these last do not. Pepuza, which is a certain town lying between Galatia and Cappadocia and Phrygia, they hold sacred. In fact, they claim that it is Jerusalem. There is, however, still another Pepuza. Furthermore, they permit women to hold authority and to officiate as priests. And they celebrate certain mysteries during

25 Obviously erroneous; see note 24.

26 Actually, this refers to the first part of Book 2 of the *Panarion.* The description of the following eighteen heresies is Epiphanius' epitome of this part (*PG* 41.845-850).

27 The correct form is *Tascodrugite.* According to Epiphanius, it is a name of Phrygian origin meaning 'nose-pegger,' from their custom of putting the forefinger to the nose while praying (*Panarion,* Heresy 48.14, *PG* 41.877B).

28 'Bread and cheese eaters.'

the course of which they pierce a new-born child with bronze needles, as is the custom of the Cataphrygians. Then, having mixed flour with its blood, they bake a host of which they partake as communion. They also tell a mythical tale of Christ revealing Himself there in Pepuza to Quintilla or Priscilla, in female form. They use both the Old and New Testaments, altering them in conformance with their own ideas.

50. *The Quartodecimans* celebrate Easter on a fixed day of the year. On that day which coincides with the fourteenth of the moon, whether it be a Saturday or Sunday, they fast and celebrate the vigil and the feast simultaneously.

51. *The Alogians,*[29] as we call them, repect the Gospel according to John and his Apocalypse, because they do not accept the divine Word as proceeding from the Father and existing eternally.

52. *The Adamians,* who get their name from a certain contemporary Adam, have a doctrine which is more absurdity than truth. They do something of this sort. Both men and women meet together, as naked as when they were born, and in this state they have their lections and prayers and whatever else they do. Leading a solitary life, as they pretend, and practicing continence, they do not accept marriage and they consider their own church to be paradise.

53. *The Sampsaeans,* or *Elkesaites,* up to the present time inhabit that part of Arabia which lies on the further side of the Dead Sea. They were led into error by Elxas, a certain false prophet, whose kinfolk, the women Marthus and Marthina, have survived to the present day and are worshiped as goddesses by the sect. They hold everything very much as do the Ebionites.

54. *The Theodotians* are named from Theodotus the shoemaker of Byzance. This man had had an excellent Greek

29 'Deniers of the Word.'

education. However, having been arrested with some others during the days of the then persecution, he alone recanted, while all the rest suffered martyrdom for the sake of God. And so, when he had fled and was reproached for this, in order to avoid the accusation of having denied God he invented the doctrine that Christ was a mere man.

55. *The Melchisedechians* venerate Melchisedech, claiming him to be some sort of a power and not just a man. They have also undertaken to reduce all things to his name.

56. *The Bardesanites.* This Bardesanes was a native of Mesopotamia. At first he held the true faith and excelled in philosophy, but he fell away from the truth and came to hold nearly the same as did Valentinus, with the exception of some things in which he differed from Valentinus.

57. *The Noetians.* This Noetus was from Smyrna in Asia. Together with some others he was carried away by vanity[30] and said that Christ was a son-father. He maintained that the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost were the same. He furthermore said that he himself was Moses and that his brother was Aaron.

58. *The Valesians,* as we have come to understand, are they who dwell in Bacathus, which is the chief town of Philadelphia of the Arabs. They make eunuchs of visitors and of chance comers among them. And among themselves, too, the greater number have been castrated and are eunuchs. They teach certain other things which are redolent of heresy and they refuse to follow the Law and the Prophets. They have also introduced certain other obscene practices.

59. *The Cathari* were connected with Novatus of Rome. They absolutely reject those who have married a second time and they do not accept penance.[31]

---

30 The text has ἐφ' ἅρματι ('on a chariot'), but the original reading is without any doubt ἐπάρματι ('by vanity'); cf. Oehler, *Corpus Haereseologicum* II-2, p. 4, n. 7.

31 That is, forgiveness of sins after baptism.

60. *The Angelici* have entirely disappeared. They either claimed to belong to an angelic order, or [they got their name] from their practice of invoking the angels.

61. *The Apostolici,* who are also called *Apotactici,* or 'Renuntiants,' appear only in Pisidia. They accept only those who give up their property. They resemble the Encratites, but have some other ideas which these last do not have.

62. *The Sabellians* hold opinions like those of Noetus, except they do not say that the Father suffered, while they do say that the Word was uttered and then again returned.

63. *The Origenians,*[32] who come from a certain Origen, are practicers of immorality. They practice unspeakable obscenities and give over their own bodies to corruption.

64. Still other *Origenians* are from Origen Adamantius the composer. They reject the resurrection of the dead. What is more, they teach that Christ and the Holy Ghost are creatures, and they explain paradise, the heavens, and everything else in an allegorical sense. They talk such nonsense as that the kingdom of Christ has sometime ceased and that the angels, too, will come to an end. They have the strange idea that Christ will rule together with the Devil and that He was crucified for the demons.

Thus far for the eighteen heresies of the fourth part of Book 2.[33]

The following five heresies are contained in the fifth part of Book 2.[34]

65. *The Paulianists* come from Paul of Samosata. This Paul comes very close to affirming that Christ does not exist, for he has made Him out to be a spoken word that began

32 Epiphanius is the only source for the existence of this sect. They are probably the same as the Origenists of the following heresy.

33 See above, note 26.

34 This refers to the second part of Book 2 of the *Panarion.* The description of the following five heresies is Epiphanius' epitome of this part (*PG* 42.9-12).

to exist from Mary. Those things said about Him in sacred Scripture as existing were spoken prophetically at a time when He did not exist. On the contrary, He began to exist from Mary from that time when He became present in the flesh.

66. *The Manichaeans,* who are also called *Aconites,*[35] are disciples of Manes the Persian. While they say that Christ is some sort of apparition, they worship the sun and moon and pray to the stars and powers and demons. They introduce two eternally existing principles, the one good and the other evil, and they hold that Christ only apparently came and suffered. They speak impiously of the Old Testament and of the God who spoke in it. They state that the whole world was not made by God, but only a part of it.

67. *The Hieracites* come from Hierax, who was a casuist from Leontopolis in Egypt. They deny the resurrection of the flesh, but use both the Old and New Testaments. Absolutely forbidding marriage, they receive anchorets, virgins, celibates, and widows. They say that children who have not as yet come of age have no share in the kingdom, because they have not been engaged in the struggle.

68. *The Meletians* in Egypt are not heretics, but schismatics. They do not hold communion with those who lapsed during the persecutions. Now they have joined with the Arians.

69. *The Arians,* who are also called *Ariomanites* and *Diatomites,*[36] are they who say that the Son of God is a creature and that the Holy Ghost is the creature of a creature. They assert that Christ did not receive His soul from Mary, but only His body.

Thus far the five heresies of the fifth part of Book 2.[37]

35 The correct form is *Acuanite,* from Acuas, the name of a third-century Manichaean teacher from Mesopotamia (*Panarion,* Heresy 66.1, *PG* 42.29A).

36 'Separaters.'

37 See above, note 34.

The following seven heresies are contained in the first part of Book 3.[38]

70. *The Audians* form a schism and faction, but not, however, a heresy. They pursue a well-ordered way of life and profess a faith which is in every respect like that of the Catholic Church. The greater part of them live in monasteries and they do not hold communion with all. They are also much addicted to the use of the apocryphal scriptures. They overly censure such of our bishops as are wealthy, and other of our bishops for other reasons. They are peculiar in that they celebrate Easter with the Jews. They also hold something peculiar and contentious in that they give a most harsh interpretation to the expression 'after the image.'[39]

71. *The Photinians.* This Photinus[40] was a native of Sirmium and had ideas similar to those of Paul of Samosata, but he differed from him in some things. He, too, asserts that Christ had his beginning from Mary.

72. *The Marcellians* come from Marcellus of Ancyra in Galatia.[41] This man was originally reputed to think very much like Sabellius, yet, although he oftentimes defended himself even in writing, he was accused by some of continuing to adhere to the Sabellians. It is possible, however, that he changed his mind and may have set himself straight, or that his disciples may have done so, because some of the moderate orthodox came to the defense of his statements.

73. *The Semiarians,* while they on the one hand confess

38 This refers to the first part of Book 3 of the *Panarion.* The description of the following seven heresies is Epiphanius' epitome of this part (*PG* 42.336-337).

39 Namely, that the 'after the image' of Gen. 1.27 refers to the body of Adam. Epiphanius, *Panarion,* Heresy 70.2 (*PG* 42.341AB).

40 Bishop of Sirmium (d. 375), a disciple of Marcellus of Ancyra. There is doubt as to the nature of his heresy and he has been accused of both Sabellianism and Arianism.

41 One of the first victims of the Arian reaction after the Council of Nicea. A strong defender of the Nicean faith, he was condemned and deposed by the arianizing party, possibly not unjustifiably, for Sabellianism.

Christ to be a creature, on the other hand captiously declare that He is not a creature like other creatures. 'But,' they say, 'we do call him Son—yet we say that He is created, lest we attribute suffering to the Father because of His having begotten Him.' In the same way they also definitely postulate a creature in the case of the Holy Ghost. They reject the 'identity in substance' of the Son and prefer to say 'similarity in substance.' Some of them, however, have rejected the similarity in substance as well.[42]

74. *The Pneumatochi,*[43] while they speak very well concerning Christ, blaspheme the Holy Ghost by making Him a creature and not of the Godhead. Rather, by a misuse of words, they say that He was produced through an operation and is nothing more than a sanctifying force.

75. *The Aerians.* This Aerius was a native of Pontus and, being still alive, he continues to be a source of annoyance. He became a priest of the Bishop Eustathius,[44] who has been accused of being an Arian. Since Aerius had not been appointed bishop, he gave out may things against the Church. While absolutely Arian in his faith, he has gone to even greater excess by holding that it is unnecessary to offer Mass for the deceased. He forbids fasting on Wednesdays and Fridays and during Lent, and also forbids the celebration of Easter. He preaches the renunciation of all worldly goods. He indulges without restraint in every sort of meat and food. Should any one of his followers wish to fast, he tells him not to do so on the stated days, but whenever he wishes—

42 The 'identity in substance' is the *homoousion,* or 'consubstantial,' of Nicea. The 'similarity in substance' is the *homoiousion* of the conservative Semiarians to which was added 'in all things.' The Semiarians who are here stated to have rejected the 'similarity' are those who supported the formula of the Council of Rimini (359) which contained the 'similarity' but had the 'in all things' deleted.

43 The Pneumatomachi, or 'Fighters against the Spirit'; otherwise known as Macedonians.

44 Bishop of Sebaste (in Armenia Minor), who was excommunicated as an Arian by the Semiarian Council of Seleucia in 359.

'For,' says he, 'you are not under any law.' He furthermore claims that there is no differences between bishop and priests.

76. *The Aetians* come from Aetius, a Cilician who was ordained deacon by the Arian bishop of Alexandria, George. They are also called *Anomoeans*[45] and, by some, *Eunomians* after a certain Eunomius who was a disciple of Aetius. Eudoxius also was one of them, but it would seem that he dissociated himself out of fear of Emperor Constantine, so that only Aetius was banished. At any rate, Eudoxius continued to be Arian-minded—although not, indeed, after the fashion of Aetius. These Anomoeans, or Aetians, completely separate Christ and the Holy Ghost from God the Father. They aver that Christ is a creature, and say that He has not even a similarity to the Father. By means of Aristotelian syllogisms and geometric proofs they attempt to explain the nature of God and in the same way try to show that Christ cannot, as they pretend, be from God. The Eunomians, who stem from them, rebaptize all those who come to them—not only [non-Arians] but even those that come from the Arians. As a strong rumor has it, they put the feet of those being baptized up in the air and baptize them on the head. They say that it is nothing serious to have erred in any way, whether by fornication or some other sin, since God requires nothing else save that one adhere to this faith which they hold.

Thus far similarly the seven heresies of the first part of Book 3.[46]

In the second part of Book 3 there are four heresies.[47]

45 'Those who reject any likeness'; extreme Arians of the post-Nicean period.

46 See above, note 38.

47 This refers to the second part of Book 3 of the *Panarion*. The description of the following four heresies in Epiphanius' epitome of this part (*PG* 42.640).

77. *The Dimoerites,*[48] who are also called *Apollinarists,*[49] confess that Christ's coming, that is to say, His Incarnation, is not perfect. Some of them have been so bold as to say that His body is consubstantial with the Godhead, while others have denied that He assumed a soul. Still others, basing their opinion upon the expression 'the Word was made flesh,' denied that He took His body from a created body, that is to say, from Mary; they stubbornly held that the Word only was made flesh. Later on, however, with what in mind I can not say, they declared that He did not assume a mind.

78. *The Antidicomarianites,*[50] say that, after having given birth to the Saviour, the blessed Mary, the ever-virgin, had marital relations with Joseph.

79. *The Collyridians,* on a certain day of the year appointed for that purpose, offer up certain *collyrida,* or cakes, in honor of this same Mary; this is the reason we have given them the name of Collyridians.

80. *The Massalians,* have a name which is interpreted as meaning *Euchites,* or 'praying people.' Also connected with these are the so-called *Euphemites, Martyrians,* and *Satanians,* who all follow the heresies practiced by the Greeks.

Thus far the recapitulation of the seventh part.[51]

Chapters of the impious doctrine of the Massalians, taken from their book.[52]

---

48 'Two-Parters,' for their claiming that the Word assumed only two parts of the humanity, that is, body and animal soul, instead of three: body, animal and spiritual soul.

49 From their founder, Apollinaris, Bishop of Laodicea in the latter half of the fourth centruy.

50 'Opponents of Mary.'

51 See above, note 47.

52 Evidently, these are chapter headings from some book of the Massalians, possibly the *Asceticus.* They are not given by Epiphanius. Timothy of Constantinople in his *The Reception of Heretics* (*PG* 86.48-52) gives nineteen points of the Massalian doctrine which appear

(1) That Satan dwells personally with man and dominates him in all things.

(2) That Satan and the demons possess the minds of men, and that human nature is held in common with the spirits of evil.

(3) That Satan and the Holy Ghost dwell together in man, and that not even the Apostles were free of the demoniac power.

(4) That not even baptism makes man perfect, nor does the communion of the Sacred Mysteries purify the soul but only that prayer which is so zealously cultivated by themselves.

(5) That even after baptism man is permeated with sin.

(6) That the faithful man receives the incorruptible godly garment not through baptism, but through prayer.

(7) That one must also attain to impassibility and that there must be a participation of the Holy Ghost experienced sensibly and with certainty.

(8) That it is necessary for the soul to feel such communion with the heavenly bridegroom as the wife feels while having relations with her husband.

(9) That spiritual men perceive both sin possessing and grace operating from within and without.

(10) That revelation is that which is given as a decree sensibly and by a divine person.

(11) That fire is a creator.

(12) That the soul which does not possess Christ sensibly and in every operation is an abode of serpents and venomous monsters, that is to say, of every adverse power.

(13) That evil is natural.

(14) That even before the fall Adam had relations with Eve impassionately.

---

to be taken from some book of theirs, but, although the doctrine is the same, the eighteen points given by the Damascene show no dependence upon them.

(15) That seed and the Word fell into Mary.

(16) They say that a man must have two souls: the one common to men and the other heavenly.

(17) They say that it is possible for man sensibly to receive the person of the Holy Ghost with all certainty and in every operation.

(18) That to them who pray it is possible for the Saviour to appear in light; and that once a man was found standing by the altar and three loaves soaked in oil were offered to him.[53]

What is more, they also avoid manual labor as not befitting Christians. And they are especially inhuman in their treatment of the poor, declaring that it is not proper that they who have renounced all worldly goods or who are entirely devoted to the doing of good should help public beggars, or abandoned widows, or those in straightened circumstances, or the mutilated, or the diseased, or those suffering from harsh creditors or from the incursions of thieves or barbarians, or such as have met with any misfortune of the sort. Rather, they say that they themselves should be furnished with everything, because they are the truly poor in spirit.

To all this they have added a contempt for churches and altars, alleging that ascetics have no need to frequent church services, since their prayers in their own oratories are quite sufficient. For such, they were accustomed to say, was the power of prayer as to make the Holy Ghost sensibly manifest to themselves and their disciples. They have this strange idea that those who would be saved must, without engaging in any other occupation whatsoever, pray until such time as they feel the sin being perceptibly driven out by the force of their prayers like some sort of smoke, or fire, or serpent, or other such beast; and until they sensibly experience the

53 The next three paragraphs are based upon some unknown source which is independent of Epiphanius, Timothy of Constantinople, and Theodoret.

return of the Holy Ghost and have in their soul a manifest perception of His entrance.[54] And this, they say, is the true communion of Christians. For those who have been baptized do by no means all participate in the Holy Ghost through the baptism of the Church or by the ordinations of clerics, unless they most assiduously have communion by their own prayers and, apart from baptism, receive the communion of the Holy Ghost, and unless they be willing to remain with them and be instructed in their doctrines. Thus, when certain priests said to them that 'we confess that we possess the Holy Ghost in faith but not sensibly,' they promised them that they, too, by praying with them should receive a share of the sensation of the Spirit. Such is the absurdity of their humbug that those of them who have supposedly participated in the sensation of the Spirit are held to be blessed, as being perfect, free of all sin, and superior. These they treat with great respect and venerate as being no longer subject to the dangers of sin. And besides all this they are indulged and exempted in the matter of food and they are shown every sort of attention, honor, and luxury. Yet, many of them, after so great a recognition of their perfection on the part of their own, have, when among outsiders, whom they do not even consider worthy to be called Christians, been observed committing various disgraceful actions, thefts of money, and fornication.

In addition to the things already recounted, they have many other strange ideas, such as that of dissolving legitimate marriages for no cause whatsoever. Those who have thus withdrawn from the married state they receive as ascetics and hold as blessed. They persuade fathers and mothers to neglect the rearing of their children. They are constantly repeating that everything should be offered to them. And

54 Cf. Timothy of Constantinople, *The Reception of Heretics* (The Marcianists) 3 (*PG* 86.48BC).

they furthermore receive with alacrity slaves running away from their masters, and sinners coming to them without any absolution, without priestly sanction, and without having passed through any of the penitential degrees established by the canons of the Church, and they engage to cleanse them speedily of all sin—provided only that they practice that much-vaunted prayer of theirs and become zealous initiates in their charlatanry. They go so far as to present certain of these for ordination as clerics before they have been absolved of sin, fraudulently persuading the bishops to impose hands by misleading them with the testimony of those of their number who are reputed to be ascetics. They are eager to do this, not because they have any esteem for clerical orders—indeed, they show contempt for the bishops themselves, whenever they have a mind to—but because they are anxious to work up a degree of power and authority for themselves. Some of them, moreover, say that they do not partake of the Mysteries unless they feel the Spirit becoming sensibly present to them at that hour. And some of them permit those who wish to cut off their own genitals. They have little regard even for excommunications. Furthermore, they take oaths and perjure themselves without any hesitation, and they will deceitfully pretend to anathematize their own heresy.

Further on the aforementioned heresy of the Massalians, who are for the most part to be found in monasteries, which is taken from the History *of Theodoret.*[55]

The heresy of the Massalians made its appearance in the time of Valentinian and Valens. Those who translate this name into Greek call them *Euchites,* or 'praying people.' They also have another name which is based upon fact, for, from their receiving into themselves the operation of some

55 Theodoret, *Ecclesiastical History* 4.10 (*PG* 82.1141-1145).

demon, which operation they take to be that of the Holy Ghost, they are called *Enthusiasts,* or 'possessed ones.' Those who are afflicted with this madness to the last degree shun manual labor as evil and indulge excessively in sleep, calling the impressions received in their dreams 'enthusiasm,' or divine possession. The authors of this heresy were Dadoes, Sabas, Adelphius, Hermas, and Simeon, and some others in addition to these. They withdrew from the Church's communion, declaring that there is neither profit nor harm in that divine Food of which Christ says: 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath everlasting life.'[56] Nevertheless, when they are put to the test, they without any shame publicly repudiate those who have these same opinions which they themselves hold in their own hearts. There was, however, a certain Litoius,[57] who ruled the Church of Melitene and was gifted with great zeal. This man, when he beheld a number of monasteries—dens of thieves, rather—infected with this plague, burned them down and drove the wolves away from the flock. And it was the same with the most praiseworthy Amphilochius, to whom was entrusted the metropolitan see of Lycaonia and who ruled over a whole nation. When he learned that this filthiness had invaded those parts, he routed it out again and freed the flocks committed to his care from that outrage.

And Flavian, the famed Bishop of Antioch,[58] having learned that they were active in Edessa and letting loose their poison to fill up whomsoever came near them, sent a band of monks and had them brought to Antioch. Then, when they absolutely denied the madness, he exposed them in the following manner. First he said that the accusers were false informers and that the witnesses were lying; then, with

56 John 6.55.
57 Letoius, Bishop of Melitene, to whom was addressed the *Canonical Epistle* (*c.* 390) of Gregory of Nyssa.
58 Bishop of Antioch (381-404).

great kindness, he invited Adelphius, who was by far the eldest, to sit down by him. 'Old man,' he said, 'we have lived life longer and have come better to know human nature and we are acquainted with the wickedness of our adversaries the demons; we have also learned through experience of the abundance of grace. But these, who are young and have no exact knowledge of these things, are unable to bear talk of a more spiritual nature. So, tell me, how do you say that it is that the hostile spirit withdraws and the grace of the Holy Ghost enters in?' Softened by these words, that old man vomited out all the hidden poison and told how baptism brings no help to its recipients and how only earnest prayers will expel the indwelling demon. He said that, just as every one born inherits his nature from his first parents, so also does he inherit a state of servitude to the demons. But, when these demons are driven out by earnest prayer, then the all-holy Spirit enters in, revealing its own presence in a sensible and visible manner, freeing the body from the movement of the passions, and entirely releasing the soul from its evil inclinations. Thus, nothing else is needed—whether it be that fasting which oppresses the body, or that discipline which restricts and teaches to walk rightly. And he who has attained this state is not only freed from the impulses of the body, but clearly foresees the future and with his eyes contemplates the Holy Trinity. The divine Flavian, having thus made the foul well-spring erupt and having contrived to lay bare the thoughts of the impious old man, then said to him: 'O inveterate of evil days, it is not I but thy mouth that hath condemned thee; thy lips have born witness against thee.' And now that this disease had been brought into the open, they were driven out of Syria. But they migrated to Pamphylia and filled that country with their infection.

Thus far the heresies up to the time of Marcian.[59]

59 Emperor of the East (450-457).

From Marcian on for a short time, and under Leo,[60] *the following heresies made their appearance.*

81. *The Nestorians*[61] hold that God the Word exists by Himself and separately, and that His humanity exists by itself. And the more humble of the Lord's actions during His sojourn among us they attribute to His humanity alone, whereas the more noble and those befitting the divinity they ascribe to God the Word alone. But they do not attribute the both to the same Person.

82. *The Eutychians,* who get their name from the heresy of Eutyches,[62] say that our Lord Jesus Christ did not take His flesh from the blessed Virgin Mary, but contend that He became incarnate in a more divine manner. For they could not conceive how God the Word could unite to Himself from the Virgin Mary this man, who was subject to the sin of his first father Adam, to the effect that 'despoiling the principalities and powers, he hath exposed them confidently in open shew,' as has been written, 'triumphing on the cross'[63] over those very things which He had put on because of the fall of the first man.

83. *The Egyptians,* who are also called *Schematics* and *Monophysites,*[64] separated from the orthodox Church on the pretext of that document [approved] at Chalcedon [and known as] the *Tome.* They have been called *Egyptians* because of the fact that during the reign[65] of Emperors Marcian and Valentian the Egyptians were the first authors of this particular kind of heresy. Because of their strong

60 Leo I, the Thracian, Emperor of the East (457-474).
61 From Nestorius, Archbishop of Constantinople (428-431).
62 Archimandrite from Constantinople, originator of Monophysism in its extreme form, but certainly not responsible for the errors here described.
63 Col. 2.15.
64 Monophysite means 'holder of one nature' (i.e., in Christ). Various explanations of Schematic have been proposed, of which the most probable is that it is a misreading of Schismatic.
65 From 450 to 455.

attachment to Dioscorus of Alexandria, who was deposed by the Council of Chalcedon for defending the teachings of Eutyches, they opposed this council and to the limit of their ability fabricated innumerable charges against it, which charges we have already taken up in this book and sufficiently refuted by showing them to be clumsy and stupid. Their leaders were Theodosius of Alexandria,[66] from whom come the Theodosians, and James of Syria,[67] from whom come the Jacobites. Privy to these as champions and strong defenders were Severus,[68] the seducer from Antioch, and John the Tritheite,[69] who expended his efforts on vain things. Both of these last denied the mystery of salvation. They wrote many things against the inspired council of the 630 Fathers of Chalcedon, and they set many snares, so to speak, and 'laid stumbling blocks by the wayside'[70] for those who are lost in their pernicious heresy. Although they hold individual substances, they destroy the mystery of the Incarnation. We have considered it necessary to discuss their impiety in brief and to add short explanations in refutation of their godless and most abominable heresy. Hence, I shall present the teachings, or ravings, rather, of their champion John, in which they take so much pride.

66 Monophysite patriarch of Alexandria (536-538), exiled to Constantinople where he carried on his Monophysite activities until his death in 566.

67 James Baradaeus ('the ragged'), founder of the Monophysite Jacobite hierarchy of Syria and Egypt, clandestinely consecrated by Theodosius in 543.

68 Monophysite patriarch of Antioch (512-518) the great theologian and saint of the Monophysites, from whom they are called Severians.

69 John Philoponus, the Grammarian, a sixth-century philosopher of Alexandria and one of the leaders of the division of the Monophysites called Tritheites. These held that for each hypostasis there was one nature, and, consequently, that Christ had one nature, while the three hypostases of the Trinity had three, and hence the name of Tritheites, or 'those who hold three Gods.' Some claim that the Damascene depended much upon Philoponus for the matter of the *Dialectica*.

70 Ps. 139.6.

On nature and hypostasis according to the teachings of the Severians, and how they teach individual substances: by John the Grammarian and Tritheite, called Philoponus, and taken from the fourth discourse of his work entitled The Arbiter.[71]

Although the common and universal basis of man's nature is in itself one, nevertheless, since it is realized in several subjects, it is multiplied and exists not partially but wholly in each of these subjects. It is just as that which makes a shipbuilder a shipbuilder, while it is one, is yet multiplied by existing in many subjects. In the same way, while the theory in the teacher is by its own nature one, yet, when it is reproduced in the pupils, it is multiplied with them and exists entirely in each of them. And again, the seal of the signet ring, which is one, is reproduced in its entirety in each of the several impressions and thus becomes many and is so said to be. Thus, the several ships, the several men, the several seals, and the several concepts in the several pupils all result as several in number in the individual subjects and they are distinct and not united. But, by their common species, many men are one, and many ships are one, and concepts, too, and the impressions have their unity in the identity of the common seal. Thus, these are all in one respect several and distinct, whereas in another respect they are united.

Now, although we often attribute number to objects having extension—as, for example, when we say that this piece of wood is two cubits—we mean that the one object is potentially two, but not actually so, because actually it is one and not two. However, we do say that it is two, because it can become two by being cut up.

71 *The Arbiter,* the most important of the works of John Philoponus. The following two fragments are from Books 4 and 7 respectively and represent all that is extant of the original Greek text, although there is a Syriac translation of the entire work.

Chapter 7 from The Arbiter.

In this seventh discourse the real truth will be confirmed from the principles laid down by them that hold the contrary. Thus, while they maintain that Christ has two natures, they hold that He has only one hypostasis, that is to say, person. They likewise disclaim both those who hold that there is one nature in Christ and those who hold that He has two hypostases. But before we undertake to refute this supposition, I think that it is wise first to define just what the teaching of the Church intends to be meant by the term *nature,* and what by that of *person* and *hypostasis.* Now, *nature* is considered to be the common basis of those things which share the same essence. Thus, common to every man is his being a rational mortal animal with the ability to understand and know, for in these things no man differs from any other. And so his essense and his nature amount to the same thing. But *hypostasis,* that is to say, *person,* is the very individual real existence of each nature, and, so to speak, an individuality made up of certain peculiarities, by which they who share in the same nature differ from each other. To put it briefly, it is that which the Peripatetics like to call atoms, or *indivisibles,* in which the division of the common genera and species terminates.

These are what the teachers of the Church called *hypostases,* or, at times, *persons.* Thus, when the animal is divided into the rational and the irrational, and then the rational into man, angel, and devil, they call those things into which each of these ultimate species is split up *individuals.* For example, man is split up into Peter and Paul, while angel is split up into Gabriel, say, and Michael, and each one of the other angels. This is because it is impossible further to divide any one of these into still other things which will continue to preserve the one same nature after the division. Thus, the division of man into soul and body brings about

the destruction of the complete animal. And so, they like to call these *individuals*. In the language of the Church, however, they are called *hypostases,* because in them the genera and the species get their existence. For, although there is a particular essence for animal, let us say, and for man, of which the former is the genus and the latter the species, yet it is in the individuals that these have their existence—as in Peter and Paul, for example—and apart from the individuals they do not subsist. And so we have explained what *hypostasis* and *nature* are according to the Church's way of explanation.

Now, this common human nature, in which no one man differs from any other, when it comes to exist in any one of the individuals, then becomes particular to that one and no other, as we set forth in Chapter 4. Thus that rational mortal animal which is in me is common to no other living thing. Certainly the individuals of the same species are not necessarily affected when a particular man, or ox, or horse is affected. It is also quite possible that when Paul died no other men did. And when Peter is born and brought into existence, those who are to come after him are not yet in existence. Consequently, each nature may be taken as an essence not in one way alone, but in two. Thus, it is taken in one way when the common basis of a nature is considered in itself as not existing in any one of the individuals, as, for example, the nature of man, of that of the horse. But it is taken in the other way when we take this same common nature as it exists in the individuals and in each of them takes on their individual existence fitting that one individual alone and no other. Thus, the rational mortal animal which is in me is not common to any other man. Neither would the animal nature which is in this particular horse be in any other, as we have just shown. That the teaching of the Church conceives of natures and hypostases in these ways is evident

from the fact that, while we confess one nature of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, we hold that these have three hypostases, that is to say, persons, by which each one is distinguished from the rest in some peculiar property. For, what might the one nature of the Godhead be but the common basis of the divine nature as considered in itself and conceived as distinct from the peculiar property of each hypostasis? Furthermore, from the fact that we hold a union of two natures in Christ—the divine I mean, and the human—from this fact it is evident that when we consider the common basis of the nature in each one of the individuals, that is to say, in each one of the hypostases, as being particular and thus not common to any of the others referable to the common species, then we acknowledge the term nature to be more particular. For we certainly do not say that the nature of the Godhead which is understood as being common to the Holy Trinity was incarnate, for in such a case we would be declaring the incarnation of the Holy Ghost. And neither do we hold the common essence of human nature to have been united to God the Word. For thus in the same way the Word of God could rightly be said to have been united both with the men living before His sojourn on earth and with those to come after. However, it is evident that we hereupon declare that nature of the common Godhead which is in the hypostasis of the Word to be a nature of the Godhead. Whence, also, we confess 'one nature incarnate of God the Word,'[72] in which by the addition of the 'of God the Word' we clearly distinguish that nature from both the Father and the Holy Ghost. And so by our having already conceived of the common essence of the divine nature as proper to the divine Word we here again declare the nature of God the Word

72 Cyril of Alexandria is responsible for this expression, which, although perfectly orthodox in the sense intended by St. Cyril, was taken in an heretical sense by the Monophysites and used by them as a watchword.

to have been incarnate. And again, we say that a human nature was united to the Word, which was that most particular existence which alone out of all the rest the Word assumed. And so, if we were to take nature in this sense, nature and hypostasis would be nearly the same thing, except for the fact that the term hypostasis includes properties which must be taken into consideration. These are they which are added to the common nature of each individual and make them distinct from one another. For this reason many of us may be found to have different ways of saying that the union was 'of natures, which is to say, of hypostases.' For the hypostasis, as we have shown, signifies the particular and individual existence of each, and so they oftentimes use these terms equivalently, since it is evident that they intend by these to signify to us the very particular nature. And this also since, both in the present discourse and in the usage of those who have treated of such things, it is the universally accepted custom to refer to the common basis of the nature as *man*—as when one says that man is a species of animal, even though no individual man is a species under the genus, nor is so called. Furthermore, we also say that man differs from the horse, quite obviously taking them as universal natures. And again, we say that Peter is a man, and Paul, and John, and that a man has been born and a man died, quite obviously taking him as an individual, even though the common basis of human nature is expressed by the same term. Now, it is only fair to state this: that with us the terms person and hypostasis often have the same meaning, just as if one were to call the same object both a sword and a blade. Thus it is that we speak indifferently of three persons or three hypostases in the Holy Trinity, treating both terms as equivalent and by either one of them meaning the same thing. Frequently, however, the person is distinguished from the hypostasis, the person being taken to mean the

mutual relation between certain individuals. This meaning of person is recognized by common usage. Thus, we say: 'such a one took on my person' and 'such a one brought action against this man's person.' We also say that the prefect represents the person of the emperor. Whence it is that the followers of Nestorius' teaching refuse to affirm either one nature in Christ or one hypostasis, since they hold there to be no union of the hypostases in themselves but suppose Him who was of Mary to be a mere man who contained within Himself the entire divine illumination. And it is by this that He differs from the rest of men, since in each one of these the divine illumination is only partially realized. Nevertheless, they confidently assert that the person of Christ is one, explaining that the relation of God the Word to the man born of Mary is one person, because He worked the entire divine dispensation in the person of the divinity of God the Word. In this sense the bad treatment accorded the man is rightly referred back to God, because both the honor and the ill treatment accorded the prefect by the subjects of the emperor is referred back to the emperor himself. In any event they declare that the appellation of *Christ* is indicative of this relation. Thus, they do not hesitate to call Christ one, because, as has been said, the relation is one, even though there may be several participating in it. So, I think that it should be clear to them that revere the Incarnation of the Saviour that we say that the Person of Christ is one, although not in the sense employed by the friends of Nestorius, that is, not in the mere relation of God to man. And it should be clear that we use the term *person* in such a sense as to declare the Person of Christ to be one hypostasis of a man like, let us say, that of Peter or of Paul.

Along with the other things, let us furthermore bear in mind this, too: that there was absolutely no lapse of time during which the humanity of Christ subsisted disunited

from the Word, but that its very beginning to be was simultaneous with its union with the Word. But we do not say that that nature is enhypostatic whose existence is independent and self-contained in respect to all other men as being distinguished from the common nature of all the rest by certain peculiar properties. For we have already shown that this is the meaning of the term hypostasis. Therefore, as in the divinity of Christ we confess both its nature and its hypostasis, so naturally we must confess this particular hypostasis as well as a nature, so that we may not be obliged to say that nature is non-subsistent, as I have said. For, one thing is clear, namely, that the humanity of the Saviour was one of the individuals participating in the common nature.

Now that these things have been accurately and clearly explained, and, I presume, have been agreed to by all, let them who suppose there to be two natures and one hypostasis in Christ tell us this: Do they confess the union to have been as well of the natures of the hypostases, since each of the parts united necessarily had a nature as well as a hypostasis, as reason has demonstrated, or do they rather think that the hypostases were united, since there was one hypostasis made of both, but that the natures were not, so that they remained two after the union?

And after some more, in which he treats of how the essence does not admit of more or less, he continues:

Now I think that it is clear that all individuals have one nature which can be realized in several hypostases. Thus, then, while we confess the nature of the Divinity to be one, we declare that It has three hypostases. Furthermore, men also have one nature, while the hypostases coming under this nature are almost infinitely multiplied. And it is the same way with other things. It is impossible for two natures to constitute one hypostasis and to preserve their duality in

number. And this is confirmed not only by the process of induction from particular examples (for how would stone or wood, or the ox or the horse, have one hypostasis or constitute one individual?), but also by the very force of reason. Thus, if each nature receives its existence in the hypostases (which is the same thing as to say 'in the individual'), then it is absolutely necessary that where there are two natures there be also at least two hypostases in which these natures will have received their existence. For it is impossible for the nature to subsist in itself without being considered as in some individual. And we have already shown that the individual is the same thing as the hypostasis. Consequently, they who affirm that not only the hypostasis was made one by the union, but the nature, also, are plainly consistent both with themselves and with the truth. On the other hand, those that affirm one hypostasis and two natures are plainly inconsistent both with themselves and with the truth. 'But,' they say, 'since the humanity of Christ had its hypostasis in the Word and did not exist before the union with the Word, for this reason we say that the hypostasis of Christ is one.' Then we ourselves might reply by asking: 'Do you or do you not think that *nature* and *hypostasis* mean the same thing, as just being different terms with the same meaning like *sword* and *blade,* or *other* and *another?*' If they are the same, then, if there is one hypostasis, there must necessarily be one nature, too—as, when there is one blade, then there must necessarily be one sword. But, if there are two natures, then the hypostases will of necessity also be two. If, however, the term nature means one thing, while that of hypostasis means something else, and if they consider a reason of Christ's hypostasis being one to be the fact that the human hypostasis, that is to say, person, did not exist prior to the union with the Word—then would not the fact of Christ's having two natures also be a reason

for the human nature's having existed prior to the union with the Word? If, however, the particular nature which was united to the Word did exist beforehand, then it is absolutely necessary for its hypostasis to have existed beforehand, too. Now, it is impossible for either of these to exist if the other one does not—I refer to the particular nature without its own hypostasis. For in their subject the both are one, even though they are oftentimes used synonymously, as we have shown a short while before. If, then, like the hypostasis, the nature that was united to the Word did not exist prior to its union with the Word—for precisely which reason they hold one hypostasis in Christ—then let them also hold that His nature is one, for as long as they do not differ in the union, then neither should they differ in this respect.

84. *The Aphthartodocetae,*[73] who come from Julian of Halicarnassus and Gaianus of Alexandria, are also called *Gaianites.* They agree with the Severians[74] in all things, with this one exception, that, while the Severians seem to hold a difference[75] in the union of Christ, they hold that the body of the Lord was incorruptible from the first instant of its formation. They also confess that the Lord endured suffering—hunger, I mean, and thirst, and fatigue—but they say that He did not suffer these in the same way that we do. For they say that we suffer these by physical necessity, while the Christ suffered them voluntarily and was not subject to the laws of nature.[76]

85. *The Agnoetae,* who are also called *Themistians,* im-

73 'Holders of incorruptibility.

74 See above, note 68.

75 That is, a distinction between the body of Christ and the Word, which would seem to contradict the Monophysite doctrine of one nature. Here the Ms. reading of διαφθοράν (corruptibility) has been changed to διαφοράν (difference) by Lequien on the basis of the Damascene's source, Leontius of Byzance (*Chapters Against Severus* 23, *PG* 86. 1909A).

76 Leontius of Byzance, *On Sects* 10 (*PG* 86.1260C).

piously declare that Christ does not know the day of judgment,[77] and they attribute fear to Him. They are a sect of the Theodosians, for Themestius,[78] the author of their heresy, held one composite nature in Christ.

86. *The Barsanouphites,* who are also called *Semidalites,* agree with the Gaianites and the Theodosians, but they have something in addition. Thus, they add fine flour[79] to the elements which Dioscorus is supposed to have consecrated, and, touching this with the tip of their finger, they taste the flour and receive it instead of the Mysteries, without making any oblation at all. Having thus eked out the elements consecrated by Dioscorus, as has been related, they keep adding the fine flour as these become gradually consumed, and for them this is considered to take the place of consecrated elements.

87. *The Hicetae*[80] are ascetics and in everything orthodox, with this exception, that they congregate with women in monasteries and offer to God hymns accompanied by music and dancing in imitation, as it were, of the dance organized in Moses' time on the occasion of the destruction of the Egyptians which took place in the Red Sea.[81]

88. *The Gnosimachi*[82] are opposed to all Christian knowledge, asserting that those who search the sacred Scriptures for some higher knowledge are doing something useless, because God requires of the Christian nothing more than good deeds. Consequently, it is better to take a more simple course and not to be curious after any doctrine arrived at by learned research.

89. *The Heliotropites* say that those plants called heliotropes which turn about with the rays of the sun have a

77 From a misinterpretation of Mark 13.32.
78 A seventh-century deacon of Alexandria.
79 σεμίδαλις; hence, the name Semidalite.
80 Lequien suggest that these might be the Euchites (or Massalians, cf. Heresy 80). The Damascene is the only source for this sect.
81 Exod. 15.20,21.
82 'Enemies of knowledge.'

certain virtue which causes such rotations in them. For this reason they are anxious to venerate them, not understanding that the movement observed in them is a natural one.

90. *The Thnetopsychites*[83] introduce the doctrine that the human soul is similar to that of beasts and that it perishes with the body.

91. *The Agonyclites* will not kneel during any of the times of prayer, but rather always pray standing up.

92. *The Theocatagnostae,*[84] who are also called *Blasphemers,* try to find fault with [the Lord] for certain words and actions, as well as with the holy persons associated with Him, and with the sacred Scriptures. They are foolhardy and blasphemous people.

93. *The Christolytae*[85] say that after His resurrection from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ left His animate body here below and ascended into heaven with His divinity alone.

94. *The Ethnophrones,*[86] while they follow some practices of pagans, are Christians in all other respects. They bring in nativity and fortune and fate, and they admit every kind of astronomy and astrology as well as every sort of divination and augury. They have recourse to auspices, the averting of evil by sacrifice, omens, interpretations of signs, spells, and similar superstitions of impious people, together with all the rest of the pagan practices. They also observe certain Greek feasts, and they furthermore keep days, and months, and seasons, and years.

95. *The Donatists* originated in Africa with a certain Donatus,[87] who handed down to them a certain bone which

83 'Holders of the mortality of the soul.'
84 'Condemners of God.'
85 'Dissolvers of Christ.'
86 'Pagan-minded.'
87 Schismatic bishop of Carthage during first half of the fourth century. The custom here referred to may well have been followed by the Donatists. At least, it was the practice of the lady Lucilla, one of the founders of the schism.

they hold in their hand and kiss before partaking of the consecrated species, whenever these are to be offered.

96. *The Ethicoproscoptae*[88] offend in the matter of morals, that is to say, in conduct; while they reject some of the most praiseworthy moral teachings, certain blameworthy ones they condone as useful.

97. *The Parermeneutae*[89] misinterpret certain passages of the Sacred Scriptures, both of the Old and of the New Testaments, and manipulate them to serve their own purpose. They are stubbornly opposed to most of the interpretations which are exact and above reproach. They suffer from a certain lack of education and judgment, whence it is that they do not know how to defend themselves and some of their heretical teachings.

98. *The Lampetians* are so called after a certain Lampetius.[90] They allow each individual to follow whatever state of life he may wish and deem fit, whether it be to live in common and lead the cenobitic life or to assume the monastic habit of his choosing. For, they say, the Christian does nothing under compulsion, because it is written: 'I will freely sacrifice to thee,'[91] and again, 'With my will I will give praise to Him.'[92] And, as some say, they permit the endurance of physical sufferings without resistance, on the ground that this is nature's due. They are also said to hold other things which very much resemble those held by those who are called Aerians.[93] (One of their number was a certain Eustathius, from whom come the *Eustathians.*)[94]

88 'Offenders against morals.'
89 'Misinterpreters.'
90 A prominent Cappadocian leader of the Euchites, or Massalians, during the last half of the fifth century.
91 Ps. 53.8.
92 Ps. 27.7.
93 For the Aerians and their founder, Aerius, see Heresy 75.
94 A later interpolation. The Euchites were sometimes called Eustathians, probably from Eustathius of Edessa, one of those condemned by Flavian of Antioch (see Heresy 80). Later, this Eustathius was confused with Eustathius of Sebaste (see note 44), who had been closely associated with Aerius.

Thus far the heresies up to the time of Heraclius.[95]

From Heraclius to the present time the following have appeared.

99. *The Monothelites* originated with Cyrus of Alexandria, but received their definite establishment from Sergius of Constantinople.[96] They proclaim two natures and one hypostasis in Christ, but they hold one will and one operation, thus destroying the duality of the natures and coming very close to the teachings of Apollinaris.

(100. *The Autoproscoptae,*[97] while they are orthodox in every respect, boldly cut themselves off from the communion of the Catholic Church. Although they pretend to require the observance of canonical ordinances, yet, being neither bishops nor presidents of the common herd, they themselves offend in the very things of which they accuse others. Thus, they openly cohabit with women and maintain them privately in their homes. They are addicted to business and profit-making and other worldly affairs. They live unreasonably and neglect in deed those things which in word they profess to maintain, so that by the judgment of the Apostle they are transgressors.[98] For, although they are monks and organized under a clergy, they honor God in word but in deed dishonor Him. Those that follow them are exalted, as it were, and walking in their own simplicity. On the contrary, the sane members of the Church respect the sacred canons, and refer matters pertaining to these to bishops and presidents, thus showing by their deeds a great respect for those whom they esteem for the sake of the good order.)

---

95 Greek emperor (610-641).

96 Cyrus, Patriarch of Alexandria (630-643); Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople (610-638).

97 'Offenders against themselves.' This heresy is not found in some manuscripts.

98 Rom. 2.3.

101. There is also the superstition of the *Ishmaelites* which to this day prevails and keeps people in error, being a forerunner of the Antichrist. They are descended from Ishmael, was was born to Abraham of Agar, and for this reason they are called both *Agarenes* and *Ishmaelites.* They are also called *Saracens,* which is derived from Σάῤῥας κενοί, or *destitute of Sara,* because of what Agar said to the angel: 'Sara hath sent me away destitute.'[99] These used to be idolaters and worshiped the morning star and Aphrodite, whom in their own language they called Khabár, which means *great.*[100] And so down to the time of Heraclius they were very great idolaters. From that time to the present a false prophet named Mohammed has appeared in their midst. This man, after having chanced upon the Old and New Testaments and likewise, it seems, having conversed with an Arian monk,[101] devised his own heresy. Then, having insinuated himself into the good graces of the people by a show of seeming piety, he gave out that a certain book had been sent down to him from heaven. He had set down some ridiculous compositions in this book of his and he gave it to them as an object of veneration.

He says that there is one God, creator of all things, who has neither been begotten nor has begotten.[102] He says that the Christ is the Word of God and His Spirit, but a creature and a servant, and that He was begotten, without seed, of Mary the sister of Moses and Aaron.[103] For, he says, the

99 Cf. Gen. 16.8. Sozomen also says that they were descended from Agar, but called themselves descendants of Sara to hide their servile origin (*Ecclesiastical History* 6.38, *PG* 67.1412AB).

100 The Arabic *kabîrun* means 'great,' whether in size or in dignity. Herodotus mentions the Arabian cult of the 'Heavenly Aphrodite' but says that the Arabs called her Alilat (Herodotus 1.131).

101 This may be the Nestorian monk Bahira (George or Sergius) who met the boy Mohammed at Bostra in Syria and claimed to recognize in him the sign of a prophet.

102 Koran, Sura 112.

103 Sura 19; 4.169.

Word and God and the Spirit entered into Mary and she brought forth Jesus, who was a prophet and servant of God. And he says that the Jews wanted to crucify Him in violation of the law, and that they seized His shadow and crucified this. But the Christ Himself was not crucified, he says, nor did He die, for God out of His love for Him took Him to Himself into heaven.[104] And he says this, that when the Christ had ascended into heaven God asked Him: 'O Jesus, didst thou say: "I am the Son of God and God"?' And Jesus, he says, answered: 'Be merciful to me, Lord. Thou knowest that I did not say this and that I did not scorn to be thy servant. But sinful men have written that I made this statement, and they have lied about me and have fallen into error.' And God answered and said to Him: 'I know that thou didst not say this word.'[105] There are many other extraordinary and quite ridiculous things in this book which he boasts was sent down to him from God. But when we ask: 'And who is there to testify that God gave him the book? And which of the prophets foretold that such a prophet would rise up?'—they are at a loss. And we remark that Moses received the Law on Mount Sinai, with God appearing in the sight of all the people in cloud, and fire, and darkness, and storm. And we say that all the Prophets from Moses on down foretold the coming of Christ and how Christ God (and incarnate Son of God) was to come and to be crucified and die and rise again, and how He was to be the judge of the living and dead. Then, when we say: 'How is it that this prophet of yours did not come in the same way, with others bearing witness to him? And how is it that God did not in your presence present this man with the book to which you refer, even as He gave the Law to Moses, with the people looking on and the mountain smoking,

104 Sura 4.156.
105 Sura 5.116ff.

so that you, too, might have certainty?'—they answer that God does as He pleases. 'This,' we say, 'We know, but we are asking how the book came down to your prophet.' Then they reply that the book came down to him while he was asleep. Then we jokingly say to them that, as long as *he* received the book in his sleep and did not actually sense the operation, then the popular adage applies to him (which runs: You're spinning me dreams.)[106]

When we ask again: 'How is it that when he enjoined us in this book of yours not to do anything or receive anything without witnesses, you did not ask him: "First do you show us by witnesses that you are a prophet and that you have come from God, and show us just what Scriptures there are that testify about you" '—they are ashamed and remain silent. [Then we continue:] 'Although you may not marry a wife without witnesses, or buy, or acquire property; although you neither receive an ass nor possess a beast of burden unwitnessed; and although you do possess both wives and property and asses and so on through witnesses, yet it is only your faith and your scriptures that you hold unsubstantiated by witnesses. For he who handed this down to you has no warranty from any source, nor is there anyone known who testified about him before he came. On the contrary, he received it while he was asleep.'

Moreover, they call us *Hetaeriasts,* or *Associators,* because, they say, we introduce an associate with God by declaring Christ to the Son of God and God. We say to them in rejoinder: 'The Prophets and the Scriptures have delivered this to us, and you, as you persistently maintain, accept the Prophets. So, if we wrongly declare Christ to be the Son of God, it is they who taught this and handed it on to us.' But some of them say that it is by misinterpretation that we have

106 The manuscripts do not have the adage, but Lequien suggests this one from Plato.

represented the Prophets as saying such things, while others say that the Hebrews hated us and deceived us by writing in the name of the Prophets so that we might be lost. And again we say to them: 'As long as you say that Christ is the Word of God and Spirit, why do you accuse us of being Hetaeriasts? For the word, and the spirit, is inseparable from that in which it naturally has existence. Therefore, if the Word of God is in God, then it is obvious that He is God. If, however, He is outside of God, then, according to you, God is without word and without spirit. Consequently, by avoiding the introduction of an associate with God you have mutilated Him. It would be far better for you to say that He has an associate than to mutilate Him, as if you were dealing with a stone or a piece of wood or some other inanimate object. Thus, you speak untruly when you call us Hetaeriasts; we retort by calling you Mutilators of God.'

They furthermore accuse us of being idolaters, because we venerate the cross, which they abominate. And we answer them: 'How is it, then, that you rub yourselves against a stone in your Ka'ba[107] and kiss and embrace it?' Then some of them say that Abraham had relations with Agar upon it, but others say that he tied the camel to it, when he was going to sacrifice Isaac. And we answer them: 'Since Scripture says that the mountain was wooded and had trees from which Abraham cut wood for the holocaust and laid it upon Isaac,[108] and then he left the asses behind with the two young men, why talk nonsense? For in that place neither is it thick with trees nor is there passage for asses.' And they are embarrassed, but they still assert that the stone is Abraham's. Then we

107 The Ka'ba, called 'The House of God,' is supposed to have been built by Abraham with the help of Ismael. It occupies the most sacred spot in the Mosque of Mecca. Incorporated in its wall is the stone here referred to, the famous Black Stone, which is obviously a relic of the idolatry of the pre-Islam Arabs.

108 Gen. 22.6.

say: 'Let it be Abraham's, as you so foolishly say. Then, just because Abraham had relations with a woman on it or tied a camel to it, you are not ashamed to kiss it, yet you blame us for venerating the cross of Christ by which the power of the demons and the deceit of the Devil was destroyed.' This stone that they talk about is a head of that Aphrodite whom they used to worship and whom they called Khabár. Even to the present day, traces of the carving are visible on it to careful observers.

As has been related, this Mohammed wrote many ridiculous books, to each one of which he set a title. For example, there is the book *On Woman*,[109] in which he plainly makes legal provision for taking four wives and, if it be possible, a thousand concubines—as many as one can maintain, besides the four wives. He also made it legal to put away whichever wife one might wish, and, should one so wish, to take to oneself another in the same way. Mohammed had a friend named Zeid. This man had a beautiful wife with whom Mohammed fell in love. Once, when they were sitting together, Mohammed said: 'Oh, by the way, God has commanded me to take your wife.' The other answered: 'You are an apostle. Do as God has told you and take my wife.' Rather—to tell the story over from the beginning—he said to him: 'God has given me the command that you put away your wife.' And he put her away. Then several days later: 'Now,' he said, 'God has commanded me to take her.' Then, after he had taken her and committed adultery with her, he made this law: 'Let him who will put away his wife. And if, after having put her away, he should return to her, let another marry her. For it is not lawful to take her unless she have been married by another. Furthermore, if a brother puts away his wife, let his brother marry her, should he so wish.'[110]

109 Koran, Sura 4.
110 Cf. Sura 2.225ff.

In the same book he gives such precepts as this: 'Work the land which God hath given thee and beautify it. And do this, and do it in such a manner'[111]—not to repeat all the obscene things that he did.

Then there is the book of *The Camel of God*.[112] About this camel he says that there was a camel from God and that she drank the whole river and could not pass through two mountains, because there was not room enough. There were people in that place, he says, and they used to drink the water on one day, while the camel would drink it on the next. Moreover, by drinking the water she furnished them with nourishment, because she supplied them with milk instead of water. Then, because these men were evil, they rose up, he says, and killed the camel. However, she had an offspring, a little camel, which, he says, when the mother had been done away with, called upon God and God took it to Himself. Then we say to them: 'Where did that camel come from?' And they say that it was from God. Then we say: 'Was there another camel coupled with this one?' And they say: 'No.' 'Then how,' we say, 'was it begotten? For we see that your camel is without father and without mother and without genealogy, and that the one that begot it suffered evil. Neither is it evident who bred her. And also, this little camel was taken up. So why did not your prophet, with whom, according to what you say, God spoke, find out about the camel—where it grazed, and who got milk by milking it? Or did she possibly, like her mother, meet with evil people and get destroyed? Or did she enter into paradise before you, so that you might have the river of milk that you so foolishly talk about? For you say that you have three rivers flowing in paradise—one of water, one of wine, and one of milk. If your forerunner the camel is outside of paradise,

111 Sura 2.223.
112 Not in the Koran.

it is obvious that she has dried up from hunger and thirst, or that others have the benefit of her milk—and so your prophet is boasting idly of having conversed with God, because God did not reveal to him the mystery of the camel. But if she is in paradise, she is drinking water still, and you for lack of water will dry up in the midst of the paradise of delight. And if, there being no water, because the camel will have drunk it all up, you thirst for wine from the river of wine that is flowing by, you will become intoxicated from drinking pure wine and collapse under the influence of the strong drink and fall asleep. Then, suffering from a heavy head after sleeping and being sick from the wine, you will miss the pleasures of paradise. How, then, did it not enter into the mind of your prophet that this might happen to you in the paradise of delight? He never had any idea of what the camel is leading to now, yet you did not even ask him, when he held forth to you with his dreams on the subject of the three rivers. We plainly assure you that this wonderful camel of yours has preceded you into the souls of asses, where you, too, like beasts are destined to go. And there there is the exterior darkness and everlasting punishment, roaring fire, sleepless worms, and hellish demons.'

Again, in the book of *The Table,* Mohammed says that the Christ asked God for a table and that it was given Him. For God, he says, said to Him: 'I have given to thee and thine an incorruptible table.'[113]

And again, in the book of *The Heifer,*[114] he says some other stupid and ridiculous things, which, because of their great number, I think must be passed over. He made it a law that they be circumcised and the women, too, and he ordered them not to keep the Sabbath and not to be baptized. And, while he ordered them to eat some of the things forbidden

113 Sura 5.114,115.
114 Sura 2.

by the Law, he ordered them to abstain from others. He furthermore absolutely forbade the drinking of wine.

102. The *Christianocategori,* or *Accusers of Christians,* are such and are so called, because those Christians who worship one living and true God praised in Trinity they accused of worshiping as gods, after the manner of the Greeks, the venerable images of our Lord Jesus Christ, of our immaculate lady, the holy Mother of God, of the holy angels, and of His saints. They are furthermore called *Iconoclasts,* because they have shown deliberate dishonor to all these same holy and venerable images and have consigned them to be broken up and burnt. Likewise, some of those painted on walls they have scraped off, while others they have obliterated with whitewash and black paint. They are also called *Thymoleontes,* or *Lion-hearted,* because, taking advantage of their authority, they have with great heart given strength to their heresy and with torment and torture visited vengeance upon those who approve of the images. This last name they have also received from their heresiarch.[115]

103. The one-hundred-and-third heresy is that of the *Aposchistae,* who are also called *Doxarii.*[116] These seek after their own glory and submit neither to the law of God nor to His priests. They are thoroughly acquainted with the heresy of the Autoproscoptae.[117] Like them, they require the observance of canonical ordinances and, although they are neither bishops nor presidents of the people, but only members of the common herd, they separate themselves from the Catholic Church. Rivaling the Euchites,[118] that is to say, the Massalians, they tell the ascetics not to frequent church services, but to be satisfied with the prayers in their own

115 Leo III, the Isaurian, Greek emperor (717-741).
116 'Makers of schism' and 'Gloriers.' These may have been connected with the Massalians or they may have been Paulicians.
117 Heresy 100.
118 Heresy 80.

monasteries. They differ among themselves and are in a state of utter confusion, because their falsehood is split into many factions. They have separated from the communion of the Church and pretend to a great severity of discipline, with each one vying to prove himself better than the next. Some of them do not admit holy baptism and do not receive Holy Communion, whereas others will kiss neither a newly made figure of the venerable cross nor a holy image. What is worst of all, since they consider themselves to be superior to all men they will accept absolutely no priest, but 'speaking lies in hypocrisy and having their conscience seared'[119] they contend in words of no profit and lay up for themselves wood, hay, and stubble[120] as most inflammable fuel for the eternal fire. May we be delivered both from the frenzy of the Iconoclasts and from the madness of the Aposchistae, which, although they are diametrically opposed evils, are equal in their impiety.

These heresies detailed above have been described in brief, because, although they amount to but a hundred altogether, all the rest come from them. The Catholic Church has kept itself away from all these, as from so many pitfalls, and, instructed by the Holy Trinity, it teaches rightly and religiously and cries out: We believe in Father and Son and Holy Ghost; one Godhead in three hypostases; one will, one operation, alike in three persons; wisdom incorporeal, uncreated, immortal, incomprehensible, without beginning, unmoved, unaffected, without quantity, without quality, ineffable, immutable, unchangeable, uncontained, equal in glory, equal in power, equal in majesty, equal in might, equal in nature, exceedingly substantial, exceedingly good, thrice radiant, thrice bright, thrice brilliant. Light is the Father, Light the

119 1 Tim. 4.2.
120 2 Tim. 2.14; 1 Cor. 3.12.

Son, Light the Holy Ghost; Wisdom the Father, Wisdom the Son, Wisdom the Holy Ghost; one God and not three Gods; one Lord the Holy Trinity discovered in three hypostases. Father is the Father, and unbegotten; Son is the Son, begotten and not unbegotten, for He is from the Father; Holy Ghost, not begotten but proceeding, for He is from the Father. There is nothing created, nothing of the first and second order, nothing of lord and servant; but there is unity and trinity—there was, there is, and there shall be forever—which is perceived and adored by faith—by faith, not by inquiry, nor by searching out, nor by visible manifestation: for the more He is sought out, the more He is unknown, and the more He is investigated, the more He is hidden. And so, let the faithful adore God with a mind that is not overcurious. And believe that He is God in three hypostases, although the manner in which He is so is beyond manner, for God is incomprehensible. Do not ask how the Trinity is Trinity, for the Trinity is inscrutable. But, if you are curious about God, first tell me of yourself and the things that pertain to you. How does your soul have existence? How is your mind set in motion? How do you produce your mental concepts? How is it that you are both mortal and immortal? But, if you are ignorant of these things which are within you, then why do you not shudder at the thought of investigating the sublime things of heaven? Think of the Father as a spring of life begetting the Son like a river and the Holy Ghost like a sea, for the spring and the river and the sea are all one nature. Think of the Father as a root, and of the Son as a branch, and of the Spirit as a fruit, for the substance in these three is one. The Father is a sun with the Son as rays and the Holy Ghost as heat. The Holy Trinity transcends by far every similitude and figure. So, when you hear of an offspring of the Father, do not think of a corporeal offspring. And when you hear that there

is a Word, do not suppose Him to be a corporeal word. And when you hear of the Spirit of God, do not think of wind and breath. Rather, hold your persuasion with a simple faith alone. For the concept of the Creator is arrived at by analogy from His creatures. Be persuaded, moreover, that the incarnate dispensation of the Son of God was begotten ineffably and without seed of the blessed Virgin, believing Him to be without confusion and without change both God and man, who for your sake worked all the dispensation. And to Him by good works give worship and adoration, and venerate and revere the most holy Mother of God and ever-virgin Mary as true Mother of God, and all the saints as His attendants. Doing thus, you will be a right worshiper of the holy and undivided Trinity, Father and Son and Holy Ghost, of the one Godhead, to whom be glory and honor and adoration forever and ever. Amen.